arXiv:1612.02972v1 [math-ph] 9 Dec 2016

The hypergroupoid of boundary conditions for local quantum observables*

Marcel Bischoff
Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, USA
E-mail: marcel.bischoff@vanderbilt.edu

Karl-Henning Rehren
Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Göttingen,
Friedrich-Hund-Platz 1, D-37077 Göttingen, Germany
E-mail: rehren@theorie.physik.uni-goettingen.de

Abstract

We review the definition of hypergroups by Sunder, and we associate a hypergroup to a type III subfactor $N \subset M$ of finite index, whose canonical endomorphism $\gamma \in \mathrm{End}(M)$ is multiplicity-free. It is realized by positive maps of M that have N as fixed points. If the depth is > 2, this hypergroup is different from the hypergroup associated with the fusion algebra of M-M bimodules that was Sunder's original motivation to introduce hypergroups.

We explain how the present hypergroup, associated with a suitable subfactor, controls the composition of transparent boundary conditions between two isomorphic quantum field theories, and that this generalizes to a hypergroupoid of boundary conditions between different quantum field theories sharing a common subtheory.

1 Introduction

1.1 Boundary conditions in quantum field theory

A boundary condition is the specification of algebraic relations between the local and covariant quantum observables ("fields") at the two sides (L = left, R = right) of a boundary in Minkowski spacetime (e.g., the surface $x = 0$). The quantum fields on both sides are assumed to share the fields of a common subtheory A defined in the entire spacetime, so that the boundary is "transparent" for A. Heuristically, the quantum field theory A is assumed to contain the stress-energy tensor whose moments are the generators

*Talk of the second author at the 9th Seasonal Institute of the Mathematical Society of Japan "Operator Algebras and Mathematical Physics", Sendai, Japan, August 2016, submitted to the proceedings.

of the Poincaré group. This property ensures (and in chiral and two-dimensional conformal QFT is equivalent) that energy and momentum are conserved at the boundary. It also implies that the theories B^L and B^R, defined only on their halfspaces, actually extend to the entire spacetime. A boundary condition may therefore be thought of as an algebraic relation between the fields defined on one side of the boundary and extended to the other side, and the field originally defined on the other side.

A boundary condition may be just a gauge transformation, when B^L and B^R are isomorphic and admit a global gauge symmetry such that the elements of A are gauge invariant. However, the general case exhibits a much richer structure due to the existence, in low spacetime dimensions, of superselection sectors (representations of A) that are not related to some gauge symmetry.

An analysis of possible transparent boundary conditions under the stated assumptions has been initiated [2], leading to a "universal construction" of a reducible boundary condition whenever $A \subset B^L$ and $A \subset B^R$ are given, along with a classification of irreducible boundary conditions. It was found that boundary conditions are in general quadratic relations, that reduce to linear ones only in special cases, including the case of gauge transformations.

In this note, we want to show that boundary conditions correspond to the elements of a hypergroup, and its composition law describes a "composition of boundary conditions". When the observables B in each region of spacetime separated by several boundaries are not isomorphic, the hypergroup is to be replaced by a hypergroupoid. Consider the juxtaposition of two boundaries, say, at $x = -a$ and $x = +a$ with observables B^L at $x < -a$, B^M at $-a < x < a$, and B^R at $x > a$. The composition of boundary condition computes the possible boundary conditions between B^L and B^R, that are compatible with two given boundary conditions between B^L and B^M and between B^M and B^R.

It shall become clear from our analysis that the hypergroup(oid)s describing the possible boundary conditions depend only on the representation category DHR(A) of the underlying common subtheory and its Frobenius algebras (Q-systems) determining the extensions. A few examples are listed in the end of Sect. 4.3.

1.2 Hypergroups

According to the definition given by Sunder and Wildberger in [22], a (finite) hypergroup is a (finite-dimensional) vector space with a distinguished basis k_i satisfying an associative multiplication

$$k_i k_j = \sum\nolimits_\ell \lambda_{ij}^\ell \cdot k_\ell \tag{1.1}$$

with non-negative real coefficients λ_{ij}^ℓ such that, for each i, j

$$\sum\nolimits_\ell \lambda_{ij}^\ell = 1. \tag{1.2}$$

There is a neutral element $k_0 = 1$ and an involution $i \leftrightarrow \overline{i}$ such that $\lambda_{ij}^0 \neq 0$ if and only if $j = \overline{i}$. In the discrete infinite case, for each i, j only finitely many λ_{ij}^ℓ are allowed to be nonzero.

This definition clearly generalizes the notion of a group, by admitting the product of two basis elements to be a convex sum of basis elements. Fusion algebras

$$f_i f_j = \sum\nolimits_\ell n_{ij}^\ell \cdot f_\ell \tag{1.3}$$

with $n_{ij}^\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$, equipped with a conjugation such that $n_{ij}^0 = \delta_{j\bar{i}}$, also define hypergroups [21] by putting $k_i := \dim_i^{-1} \cdot f_i$, where $\dim_i \geq 1$ is the Perron-Frobenius dimension of f_i. In particular, also the duals of compact groups are hypergroups.

Fusion algebras were Sunder's original definition of hypergroups in [21], where he had in mind the fusion algebra of M-M bimodules of a (finite-index finite-depth type II_1) subfactor $N \subset M$. There, he also showed the uniqueness of the dimension function $f_i \to \dim_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$. As a consequence of the integrality of n_{ij}^ℓ, the coefficients λ_{ij}^ℓ of a finite hypergroup must be algebraic numbers. The latter condition was, however, dropped in the definition in [22]. This is a proper generalization, since every $\lambda \in (0,1)$ defines a two-element hypergroup by $k_1^2 = \lambda \cdot k_0 + (1-\lambda) \cdot k_1$, whereas according to the definition in [21], λ must be of the form $x = 1 + \frac{1}{2}r - r\sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + r^{-1}}$ with $r = (n_{11}^1)^2/n_{11}^0 \in \mathbb{Q}$.

Examples of the more general definition in [22] include also the hypergroups $\mathrm{Conj}(G)$ of the (properly normalized sums over the elements of) conjugacy classes of a finite group, or double cosets of a finite group with respect to some subgroup. These arise by rescaling relations of the form Eq. (1.3) where, however, possibly $n_{i\bar{i}}^0 > 1$.

The weight $\mu_i \geq 1$ of an element k_i of a hypergroup is by definition the inverse of the coefficient $\lambda_{i\bar{i}}^0$. In particular, for the hypergroup associated with a fusion algebra,

$$\mu_i = (\dim_i)^2. \tag{1.4}$$

The Haar measure of a hypergroup is the convex combination

$$H = \big(\sum\nolimits_i \mu_i\big)^{-1} \sum\nolimits_i \mu_i k_i. \tag{1.5}$$

It satisfies $H = \overline{H} = H^2 = Hk_i = k_i H$ for all i.

In the present note, we adhere to the latter, more general definition of a hypergroup as in [22], and associate another natural hypergroup $K_{N\subset M}$ to a finite-index subfactor [1], different from the one coming from the fusion algebra of M-M bimodules when the depth is > 2.

Our definition requires a condition of multiplicity-freeness: If $M \subset M_1$ is the Jones basic construction of $N \subset M$, then M_1 as an M-M bimodule is assumed to decompose into irreducible bimodules without multiplicities. This is the case for subfactors $N = M^G \subset M$ given by the fixed points under an outer action of a group G (where the M-M bimodules are in one-to-one correspondence with the elements $g \in G$), but also for many other subfactors.

1.3 The hypergroupoid of boundary conditions

Our motivation comes from quantum field theory. We are interested in the local subfactors $A(O) \subset B(O)$, where $A(O)$ and $B(O)$ are the algebras of observables localized in a

spacetime region O of a QFT B and a subtheory A. For suitable regions (double cones or intervals), the structure of this subfactor does not depend on O, and it completely determines the extension $A \subset B$ of the quantum field theories. (Because we want to concentrate on the subfactor aspects, we do not record in detail the necessary technical assumptions [2, 15], that are satisfied by large classes of (conformal) quantum field theories.) Because the structure is independent of the region, O will be indicated below only for the sake of definiteness.

Since the local algebra are of type III, the Jones theory of subfactors has to be appropriately adapted [13, 14]. Instead of X-Y bimodules (where X and Y may be either N or M), one deals with homomorphisms $Y \to X$. In particular, in the quantum field theory context, the N-N bimodules correspond to DHR endomorphisms of A localized in O, considered as endomorphisms of $N = A(O)$. The irreducible endomorphisms γ_a contained in the canonical endomorphism γ of $M = B(O)$ replace the M-M bimodules contained in M_1, and may be thought of as generalizations of gauge automorphisms.

The subfactors $A(O) \subset B(O)$ fulfil the above-mentioned multiplicity-freeness as a consequence of locality. The elements k_a of the associated hypergroup $K_{A\subset B}$ according to [1] are then realized by completely positive maps $\phi_a : B \to B$, whose fixed points in $B(O)$ are the elements of $A(O)$. In special cases, these positive maps may be automorphisms and coincide with γ_a. Thus, the hypergroup is an appropriate generalized symmetry concept for local extensions $A \subset B$.

We shall show in Sect. 4.2 that the elements of the hypergroup $K_{A\subset B}$ characterize the algebraically admitted boundary conditions between two isomorphic copies B^L and B^R of an extension B of A, regarded as quantum field theories defined to the left and right of a boundary in space. We show in Sect. 4.3 that the hypergroup composition law controls the composition of boundary conditions, and in Sect. 4.4, we sketch the (immediate) generalization to the general case when B^L and B^R may range over several inequivalent local extensions of a (given) quantum field theory A.

2 Subfactors

We deal with type III subfactors, which is the appropriate setting for the intended applications in quantum field theory. However, the content of this and the next section can be literally translated into the more popular type II_1 setting, by substituting "bimodules" for "homomorphisms".

For two (type III) factors A, B and a pair of homomorphisms $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 : A \to B$, intertwiners are the elements of the linear spaces in B

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = \{t \in B : t\varphi_1(a) = \varphi_2(a)t \ \forall a \in A\}.$$

Clearly, $t^* \in \mathrm{Hom}(\varphi_2, \varphi_1)$ iff $t \in \mathrm{Hom}(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)$. The concatenation product of $t_1 \in \mathrm{Hom}(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)$ and $t_2 \in \mathrm{Hom}(\varphi_2, \varphi_3)$ is the operator multiplication

$$t_2 \circ t_1 := t_2 \cdot t_1 \in \mathrm{Hom}(\varphi_1, \varphi_3).$$

For $\varphi_1, \varphi_3 : A \to B$ and $\varphi_2, \varphi_4 : B \to C$, the monoidal product of $t_1 \in \mathrm{Hom}(\varphi_1, \varphi_3)$ and $t_2 \in \mathrm{Hom}(\varphi_2, \varphi_4)$ is

$$t_2 \times t_1 := t_2\varphi_2(t_1) \equiv \varphi_4(t_1)t_2 \in \mathrm{Hom}(\varphi_2\varphi_1, \varphi_4\varphi_3). \tag{2.1}$$

With the monoidal product of homomorphisms $\varphi_1 \times \varphi_2 := \varphi_1\varphi_2$, one has a C* two-category whose objects are factors, the one-morphisms are homomorphisms, and the two-morphisms are intertwiners.

For $\varphi_1, \varphi : A \to B$, we write $\varphi_1 \prec \varphi$ if there is an isometry $t \in \mathrm{Hom}(\varphi_1, \varphi)$. In the type III case, every projection in B can be written as $e = tt^*$ with an isometry $t \in B$, and $\varphi_1(\cdot) := t^*\varphi(\cdot)t$ defines $\varphi_1 \prec \varphi$, regarded as the "range" of the projection $e \in \mathrm{Hom}(\varphi, \varphi)$. Conversely, one may define the "direct sum" of homomorphisms $\varphi_i : A \to B$ (unique up to unitary equivalence) by choosing a partition of unity $1_B = \sum_i e_i$, writing $e_i = t_i t_i^*$, and defining $\varphi(\cdot) = \sum_i t_i\varphi_i(\cdot)t_i^*$.

2.1 Conjugate endomorphisms

Two homomorphisms $\varphi : A \to B$ and $\overline{\varphi} : B \to A$ are conjugate to each other if there is a pair of intertwiners $r \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{id}_A, \overline{\varphi}\varphi)$ and $\overline{r} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{id}_B, \varphi\overline{\varphi})$ satisfying the conjugacy relations

$$(\mathbf{1}_\varphi \times r^*) \circ (\overline{r} \times \mathbf{1}_\varphi) = 1_B, \quad (\mathbf{1}_{\overline{\varphi}} \times \overline{r}^*) \circ (r \times \mathbf{1}_{\overline{\varphi}}) = 1_A. \tag{2.2}$$

r and $\overline{r}$ are multiples of isometries (because $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{id}, \mathrm{id}) = \mathbb{C} \cdot 1$ for a factor) and can be normalized such that

$$r^* \circ r = d \cdot \mathbf{1}_A, \quad \overline{r}^* \circ \overline{r} = d \cdot \mathbf{1}_B. \tag{2.3}$$

If φ is irreducible, $d \geq 1$ is unique, and is called the dimension of φ. If φ is reducible, $\dim_\varphi$ is defined as the infimum of d over all solutions to the conjugacy relations Eq. (2.2), and a solution $(r, \overline{r})$ saturating the infimum is called standard. One has $(\dim_\varphi)^2 = (\dim_{\overline{\varphi}})^2 = [B : \varphi(A)]$, and the dimension is additive under direct sums and multiplicative under composition of homomorphisms.

Let $N \subset M$ be a type III subfactor of finite index $[M : N] = d^2$. Let $\iota : N \hookrightarrow M$ be the embedding homomorphism $\iota(n) = n \in M$, and $\overline{\iota} : M \to N$ a conjugate homomorphism, and (w, v) a standard solution to the conjugacy relations Eq. (2.2). We call $\gamma := \iota\overline{\iota}$ the canonical endomorphisms (of M), and $\theta := \overline{\iota}\iota$ the dual canonical endomorphisms (of N). Thus $w \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{id}_N, \theta)$ and $v \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{id}_M, \gamma)$, and $\dim_\iota = d$. Because $1_M = \iota(w^*)v$, one has $m = 1_M m = \iota(w^*\overline{\iota}(m))v$ and hence

$$M = \iota(N) \cdot v, \tag{2.4}$$

i.e., v together with N generates M. We shall refer to v as the canonical generator of $N \subset M$.

The conjugation data define a conditional expectation $\mu : M \to N$ (unique in the irreducible case)

$$\mu(\cdot) = \dim_\iota^{-1} \cdot w^*\overline{\iota}(\cdot)w. \tag{2.5}$$

If $A = B^G$ are the fixed points under the outer action of a finite group G, then $[B : A] = |G|$, $\dim_\iota = |G|^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $\mathrm{Hom}(\theta, \theta)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}G$, $\mathrm{Hom}(\gamma, \gamma)$ is commutative and isomorphic to $C(G)$. More precisely, the irreducible sub-homomorphisms of γ are the group automorphisms α_g, $g \in G$, and the condition expectation is the group average

$$\iota \circ \mu(\cdot) = |G|^{-1} \sum\nolimits_{g \in G} \alpha_g(\cdot).$$

Frobenius reciprocity defines a bijective linear "Fourier transformation" $\mathrm{Hom}(\theta, \theta) \to \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma, \gamma)$ by

$$\chi(t) := (v^* \times 1_\gamma) \circ (1_\iota \times t \times 1_{\overline{\iota}}) \circ (1_\gamma \times v) = \chi(t^*)^* \tag{2.6}$$

with inverse

$$\chi^{-1}(s) = (1_\theta \times w^*) \circ (1_{\overline{\iota}} \times s \times 1_\iota) \circ (w \times 1_\theta) = \chi^{-1}(s^*)^*. \tag{2.7}$$

χ and χ^{-1} turn the concatenation products of the algebras $\mathrm{Hom}(\theta, \theta)$ and $\mathrm{Hom}(\gamma, \gamma)$ into the "convolution products"

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 * t_2 &:= \chi^{-1}(\chi(t_1) \circ \chi(t_2)), \\ s_1 * s_2 &:= \chi(\chi^{-1}(s_1) \circ \chi^{-1}(s_2)) \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

with unit ww^* respectively vv^*.

(The terminology is justified because in the fixed point case $A = B^G$ with an abelian group G, χ is the usual Fourier transform between G and $\widehat{G}$ and $*$ is the usual convolution product.)

2.2 Q-systems

Given a subfactor $N \subset M$ and $w \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{id}_N, \theta)$ and $v \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{id}_M, \gamma)$ as above, define $x := \overline{\iota}(v) \in \mathrm{Hom}(\theta, \theta^2)$. The data

$$Q = (\theta, w, x)$$

with normalizations $w^* \circ w = (\dim_\theta)^{1/2}$, $x^* \circ x = (\dim_\theta)^{1/2} \cdot 1_\theta$ satisfy the relations

$$(1_\theta \times w^*) \circ x = 1_\theta = (w^* \times 1_\theta) \circ x,$$

$$(1_\theta \times x^*) \circ (x \times 1_\theta) = x \circ x^* = (x^* \times 1_\theta) \circ (1_\theta \times x),$$

$$(1_\theta \times x) \circ x = (x \times 1_\theta) \circ x,$$

that define a Frobenius algebra or Q-system in the tensor category $\mathrm{End}_0(N)$ (= the C* tensor category of endomorphisms of N with finite dimension). The Q-system encodes $N \subset M$ as an extension of N uniquely up to isomorphism [14].

We shall freely use the relations of the Q-system, as well as the conjugacy relations Eq. (2.2) throughout.

In terms of the Q-system, the convolution product of $\mathrm{Hom}(\theta,\theta)$ reads

$$t_1 * t_2 = x^* \circ (t_1 \times t_2) \circ x. \tag{2.9}$$

If θ belongs to a braided full subcategory of $\mathrm{End}_0(N)$ with braiding ε, then Q is called commutative iff $\varepsilon_{\theta,\theta} \circ x = x$.

Proposition 2.1. *If θ belongs to a braided subcategory of $\mathrm{End}_0(N)$ and Q is commutative, then $[\mathrm{Hom}(\theta,\theta), *]$ is commutative. Equivalently, $[\mathrm{Hom}(\gamma,\gamma), \circ]$ is commutative. As a consequence, γ is multiplicity-free:*

$$\gamma \simeq \bigoplus\nolimits_a \gamma_a$$

with γ_a irreducible and pairwise inequivalent.

Proof: The commutativity of the convolution product of $\mathrm{Hom}(\theta,\theta)$ follows by

$$x^* \circ (t_1 \times t_2) \circ x = x^* \circ \varepsilon^*_{\theta,\theta} \circ (t_2 \times t_1) \circ \varepsilon_{\theta,\theta} \circ x = x^* \circ (t_2 \times t_1) \circ x$$

where the second equality is the commutativity of Q. Hence $\mathrm{Hom}(\gamma,\gamma)$ is commutative with respect to the ordinary $=$ concatenation product. Because the irreducible decomposition of γ is controlled by the projections in $\mathrm{Hom}(\gamma,\gamma)$, the absence of multiplicities follows. □

In the appendix, we record an unexpected quantization result for the dimensions $\dim_{\gamma_a}$, that arises as a corollary of this fact.

3 The hypergroup of a subfactor

Let $N \subset M$ be an irreducible type III subfactor, and $\theta = \overline{\iota}\iota$, $\gamma = \iota\overline{\iota}$ and $w \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{id}_N, \theta)$, $v \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{id}_M, \gamma)$, and $Q = (\theta, w, x)$ as in Sect. 2.

We assume that γ is multiplicity-free. By Prop. 2.1, this is certainly the case whenever the Q-system is commutative; but the existence of a braiding for θ is neither needed nor assumed in this section.

3.1 Positive maps

Let $e_a \in \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma,\gamma)$ be the projections onto $\gamma_a \prec \gamma$ and choose isometries $s_a \in \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma_a, \gamma)$, such that $e_a = s_a s_a^*$ and $\sum_a s_a s_a^* = 1_M$.

Then we decompose the conditional expectation Eq. (2.5), considered as a positive map of M into itself, as

$$\iota \circ \mu(\cdot) = \frac{1}{\dim_\iota} \cdot \iota(w^*)\gamma(\cdot)\iota(w) = \frac{1}{\dim_\iota} \cdot \iota(w^*) \sum\nolimits_a s_a \gamma_a(\cdot) s_a^* \iota(w),$$

where $s_a^*\iota(w) \in \mathrm{Hom}(\iota, \gamma_a\iota)$ are multiples of isometries, $\iota(w^*)s_a s_a^*\iota(w) = \dim_{\gamma_a}/\dim_\iota$. In terms of isometries $h_a = (\dim_\iota/\dim_{\gamma_a})^{\frac{1}{2}} s_a^*\iota(w)$,

$$\iota \circ \mu(\cdot) = \frac{1}{\dim_\gamma} \sum\nolimits_a \dim_{\gamma_a} \cdot h_a^* \gamma_a(\cdot) h_a =: \frac{1}{\dim_\gamma} \sum\nolimits_a \dim_{\gamma_a} \cdot \phi_a(\cdot). \tag{3.1}$$

Proposition 3.1. *[1] (i) The unital positive maps*

$$\phi_a(\cdot) = h_a^* \gamma_a(\cdot) h_a : M \to M \tag{3.2}$$

are N-linear maps (i.e., $\phi_a(n_1 m n_2) = n_1 \phi_a(m) n_2$) with fixed points N.
(ii) ϕ_a form a hypergroup $K_{N\subset M}$ under composition, with coefficients given in Eq. (3.4).
(iii) The Haar measure of $K_{N\subset M}$ is $\iota \circ \mu$ as in Eq. (3.1). In particular, the weights are

$$\mu_a = \dim_{\gamma_a}. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof: (i) The N-linearity is immediate by the definition of ϕ_a and implies the trivial action on N by choosing $m = 1$. Conversely, if $\phi_a(m) = m$ for all a, then $\iota\mu(m) = m$ by Eq. (3.1), hence $m \in N$.
(ii) We have

$$\phi_a \circ \phi_b(\cdot) = (\dim_\iota)^2 \cdot \iota(w^*) s_{ab}^* \gamma_a\gamma_b(\cdot) s_{ab} \iota(w)$$

where $s_{ab} \equiv (s_a \times s_b) \circ (1_\iota \times w \times 1_{\overline{\iota}}) \in \mathrm{Hom}(\iota\overline{\iota}, \gamma_a\gamma_b)$. Splitting $\gamma_a\gamma_b$ into irreducibles,

$$\phi_a \circ \phi_b(\cdot) = (\dim_\iota)^2 \cdot \sum\nolimits_{\gamma_i \prec \gamma_a\gamma_b} \iota(w^*) s_{ab}^* t_i \gamma_i(\cdot) t_i^* s_{ab} \iota(w)$$

where $t_i \in \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma_i, \gamma_a\gamma_b)$. The intertwiner $s_{ab}^* \circ t_i$ is in $\mathrm{Hom}(\gamma_i, \iota\overline{\iota}) = \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma_i, \gamma)$; hence it vanishes if γ_i is not contained in γ (which is possible if the depth is > 2); and it is a multiple $\alpha_{ab}^c \cdot s_c$ of s_c if $\gamma_i = \gamma_c \prec \gamma$. Thus the sum runs only over the subsectors γ_c of γ, and each summand is a positive multiple of $\phi_c(\cdot)$:

$$\phi_a \circ \phi_b = \sum\nolimits_c \lambda_{ab}^c \cdot \phi_c \quad \text{with} \quad \lambda_{ab}^c = \dim_\iota \cdot |\alpha_{ab}^c|^2. \tag{3.4}$$

Because all ϕ_c are unital maps, the convex property of the coefficients is automatic. Moreover, because also $\gamma_c \prec \gamma_a\gamma_b$, it follows that $\lambda_{ab}^0 > 0$ iff $b = \overline{a}$.
(iii) From the fact that $\phi_a(\iota(\cdot)) = \iota(\cdot)$, we conclude $\phi_a \circ \iota\mu = \iota\mu$, and because the Haar measure is the unique convex sum satisfying $\phi_a \circ H = H$ for all a, it follows that $H = \iota\mu$.
□

If $\omega = \omega \circ \mu$ is an invariant state on M, then it follows from (iii) that $\omega = \omega \circ \phi_a$ for all a. Thus, the positive maps ϕ_a are stochastic maps with respect to ω.

Remark 3.2. *Compare the hypergroup $K_{N\subset M}$ with the hypergroup associated with the fusion algebra of the M-M bimodules of a subfactor of finite depth as in Sect. 1.2. In the type III case, the M-M bimodules are the irreducible subsectors γ_i of arbitrary powers of γ, of which $\gamma_a \prec \gamma$ are only a subset. γ_a exhaust all γ_i if the depth is $= 2$. In this case, the two hypergroups are the same. Indeed, the conflicting formulas Eq. (1.4) and Eq. (3.3) coalesce in this case, because if a subfactor $N \subset M$ has depth 2 and γ is multiplicity-free (e.g., in the case of a fixed-point subfactor), then all $\gamma_a \prec \gamma$ have dimension 1 (γ_a are automorphisms of M).*

Example: The Goodman-de la Harpe-Jones subfactor of index $3+\sqrt{3}$ [10] has $\gamma = \mathrm{id}_M + \gamma_1$ where γ_1 has dimension $d_1 = 2+\sqrt{3}$. Thus, the associated hypergroup K_{GHJ} is given by $\phi_1^2 = d_1^{-1}(\phi_0 + (d_1-1)\phi_1)$. This is not the hypergroup of any fusion algebra $f_1^2 = f_0 + nf_1$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$, cf. [1, Sect. 4.6]. But it happens to be a quotient of the hypergroup of the fusion algebra of the M-M bimodules (the irreducible subsectors of powers of γ) that was computed in [11, Table 3]. This is always true for hypergroups associated with commutative Q-systems in modular tensor categories [1, Thm. 5.16], but not in general: e.g., the dual of the GHJ subfactor has the same hypergroup $K_{M\subset M_1} \cong K_{N_1\subset N} \cong K_{\mathrm{GHJ}}$, but it is not a quotient of the hypergroup of the fusion algebra of the N-N bimodules (the subsectors of powers of $\theta = \mathrm{id}_N + \theta_1$, [11, Table 2]).
More examples can be found at the end of Sect. 4.3.

3.2 Matrix representations

A unitary matrix representation of a hypergroup K is a homomorphism U of K into $\mathrm{Mat}_m(\mathbb{C})$ such that $U(\overline{k}) = U(k)^*$. (This does *not* mean that $U(k)$ are unitary matrices.) We obtain the irreducible matrix representations of the hypergroup $K_{N\subset M}$ as follows.

Let $\theta_n \prec \theta$ be irreducible, arising with multiplicities $m_n = \dim \mathrm{Hom}\,(\theta_n, \theta)$. By Frobenius reciprocity $\dim \mathrm{Hom}(\theta_n, \theta) = \dim \mathrm{Hom}(\iota, \iota\theta_n)$. Hence there are bases of m_n orthonormal isometries $\psi_{n,i} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\iota, \iota\theta_n)$ $(i = 1, \dots m_n)$. They can be written as $\psi_{n,i} = \iota(w_{n,i}^*)v$ with $w_{n,i} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\theta_n, \theta)$, and $w_{n,i}^* w_{n,j} = (\dim_\iota / \dim_{\theta_n}) \cdot \delta_{ij}$ [3]. With $\theta_0 = \mathrm{id}_N \prec \theta$ $(m_0 = 1)$ and $w_0 = w$, one has $\psi_0 = 1_M$.

Proposition 3.3. *The positive maps ϕ_a of Prop. 3.1 act linearly on the spaces* $\mathrm{Hom}(\iota, \iota\theta_n)$. *The coefficients in*

$$\phi_a(\psi_{n,i}) = \sum\nolimits_j \psi_{n,j} \cdot U_n(a)_{ji} \tag{3.5}$$

form irreducible unitary matrix representations U_n of $K_{N\subset M}$.

Proof: Obviously, $h_a^* \gamma_a(\psi_{n,i}) h_a \in \mathrm{Hom}(\iota, \iota\theta_n)$, and the homomorphism property is automatic. The *-property follows from $(\psi_{n,i})^* = \iota(r_n^*)\psi_{\overline{n},i}$ with $r_n \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{id}_N, \overline{\theta}_n\theta_n)$. □

Proposition 3.4. *The representations U_n are irreducible and pairwise inequivalent. They exhaust the irreducible representations of $K_{N\subset M}$.*

To prove Prop. 3.4, we first state two Lemmas.

Lemma 3.5. *The matrix coefficients $U_n(a)_{ji} = \psi_{n,j}^* \phi_a(\psi_{n,i})$ are given by*

$$U_n(a)_{ji} \cdot 1_\iota = \frac{\dim_\iota}{\dim_{\gamma_a}} \cdot (v^* \times 1_\iota) \circ (\iota \times w_{n,j} w_{n,i}^*) \circ (e_a \times 1_\iota) \circ (1_\iota \times w),$$

or equivalently

$$U_n(a)_{ji} \cdot 1_{\theta_n} = (v^* \times s_a^*) \circ (1_\iota \times w_{n,j} w_{n,i}^* \times 1_{\overline{\iota}}) \circ (s_a \times v). \tag{3.6}$$

Proof: The first equality follows by inserting $\psi_{n,i} = \iota(w^*_{n,i})v$ into the definition of ϕ_a. The equivalence is established by applying to the expressions on the right-hand sides the traces $\mathrm{tr}_\iota(t) = v^* \circ t \circ v$ ($t \in \mathrm{Hom}(\iota,\iota)$) and $\mathrm{tr}_{\theta_a}(t') = \overline{r}^*_a \circ t' \circ \overline{r}_a$ ($t' \in \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma_a,\gamma_a)$) where $(r_a, \overline{r}_a)$ is a standard solution to the conjugacy relations for γ_a and $\overline{\gamma}_a$, and exploiting the trace property [16]. □

Notice that up to normalization, $U_n(a)_{ji}$ coincide with the pairing between the projections $e_a \in \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma,\gamma)$ and the matrix units of $\mathrm{Hom}(\theta,\theta)$ in [17]. There are as many matrix units as there are projections e_a, namely $\dim \mathrm{Hom}(\theta,\theta) = \dim \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma,\gamma) = |K_{N\subset M}|$. By similar standard computations using the trace property [16] as before, one finds

Lemma 3.6. *The square matrices* $S^a_{n,i,j} = \frac{\sqrt{\dim_{\gamma_a} \dim_{\theta_n}}}{\dim_\iota} \cdot U_n(a)_{ji}$ *are unitary. Explicitly,*

$$\sum\nolimits_a \dim_{\gamma_a} \dim_{\theta_n} \overline{U_n(a)_{ji}} U_{n'}(a)_{j'i'} = \delta_{nn'}\delta_{ii'}\delta_{jj'} \cdot (\dim_\iota)^2. \tag{3.7}$$

Eq. (3.7) may be read as the orthogonality of the functions $a \mapsto U_n(a)_{ji}$ with respect to the inner product induced by the Haar measure

$$(f,g)_H = \big(\sum\nolimits_a \mu_a\big)^{-1} \sum\nolimits_a \overline{f(a)} \mu_a g(a).$$

The corresponding Hilbert space carries the regular representation

$$(R_b f)(a) = \sum\nolimits_c \lambda^c_{ab} f(c).$$

Proof of Prop. 3.4: Let $k_a \in K_{N\subset M}$ stand for the abstract basis elements of the hypergroup defined by the composition law Eq. (3.4) of the positive maps ϕ_a. The linear map defined on the basis by $k_a \mapsto \bigoplus_n U_n(a)$ is an algebra homomorphism $K_{N\subset M} \to \bigoplus_n \mathrm{Mat}_{m_n}(\mathbb{C})$. It is bijective, hence an isomorphism by Lemma 3.6. Under this isomorphism, the representations U_n pass to the restrictions of $\bigoplus_n \mathrm{Mat}_{m_n}(\mathbb{C})$ to $\mathrm{Mat}_{m_n}(\mathbb{C})$. Since the latter are the inequivalent irreducible matrix representations of $\bigoplus_n \mathrm{Mat}_{m_n}(\mathbb{C})$, the claim follows. □

4 Boundary conditions

We now turn to the application of Sect. 3 to boundary conditions in quantum field theory, as exposed in Sect. 1.1.

4.1 General setup

We consider a boundary separating two local quantum field theories B^L and B^R with a common subtheory A. Locality ensures that the Q-systems Q^L for $A(O) \subset B^L(O)$ and Q^R for $A(O) \subset B^R(O)$ are commutative [15], with the braiding of the dual canonical endomorphisms given by the DHR braiding of A.

To comply with the physical interpretation as a transparent boundary, the relative algebraic position of the local algebras $B^L(O)$ and $B^R(O)$ must fulfil several algebraic conditions. A "boundary condition" is a realization of these conditions on a Hilbert space. The conditions can be cast into the following form [2]: For each O one has a subfactor $A(O) \subset C(O)$ with intermediate embeddings $\jmath^L$ of $B^L(O)$ and $\jmath^R$ of $B^R(O)$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & \overset{\iota^L}{\hookrightarrow} & B^L(O) & \overset{\jmath^L}{\searrow} & \\ A(O) & & & & C(O) \\ & \underset{\iota^R}{\searrow} & & \underset{\jmath^R}{\hookrightarrow} & \\ & & B^R(O) & & \end{array} \tag{4.1}$$

Thus, one has[1]

$$\jmath^L \circ \iota^L = \jmath^R \circ \iota^R. \tag{4.2}$$

In addition, the crucial requirement is locality: $\jmath^L(B^L(O_1))$ must commute with $\jmath^R(B^R(O_2))$ whenever $O_1 \subset O$ lies to the spacelike left of $O_2 \subset O$ ("left-locality").

Finally, one has $C(O) = \jmath^L(B^L(O)) \vee \jmath^R(B^R(O))$. (If this is not the case, we call C a defect; a general theory of defects is still under investigation [4].) The boundary condition is called irreducible, if the subfactor $A(O) \subset C(O)$ is irreducible.

The condition Eq. (4.2) is nontrivial even if $B^L(O) = B^R(O) \equiv B(O)$ and $\iota^L = \iota^R$, because still $\jmath^L$ may be different from $\jmath^R$. In this case, we have two different embeddings of the same algebra into $C(O)$; the boundary condition then specifies the way in which $\jmath^L$ and $\jmath^R$ may differ. It is our main result in Sect. 4.2 that they differ (in a way to be detailed) by a positive map ϕ_a representing an element k_a of the hypergroup K associated with $A \subset B$, as mentioned above. In particular, if $A(O) = B(O)^G$ are the fixed points under a global gauge group, one has $K = G$, and the two embeddings differ by a gauge transformation.

We shall establish in Sect. 4.3 that the composition law Eq. (1.1) of the hypergroup describes the juxtaposition of two boundaries, making contact with [18].

In [2], we have defined a "universal construction" as a solution to Eq. (4.1), where $C(O) = C_{\text{uni}}(O)$ is not a factor. (For the necessary adaptation to the case $N \subset M$ where M is not a factor, cf. [3, Sect. 2.3].) The central decomposition of $C_{\text{uni}}(O)$ gives rise to irreducible solutions to Eq. (4.1) (= boundary conditions), and every boundary condition arises in this decomposition.

One should, of course, construct $A(O) \subset C_{\text{uni}}(O)$ for every O (interval or double-cone). Here, we just sketch the construction for one fixed region O. One has $C_{\text{uni}}(O) = \iota_{\text{uni}}(A(O)) \cdot V_{\text{uni}}$, where the dual canonical endomorphism $\Theta_{\text{uni}} = \overline{\iota}_{\text{uni}}\iota_{\text{uni}}$ is the restriction to $A(O)$ of a DHR endomorphism of the net A localized in O. The extension to arbitrary regions O_1 proceeds by a standard method: $C_{\text{uni}}(O_1) = \iota_{\text{uni}}(A(O_1)) \cdot \iota_{\text{uni}}(u)V$ where $u \in A$ is a unitary charge transporter such that $\mathrm{Ad}_u \circ \Theta_{\text{uni}}$ is localized in O_1.

[1] The embeddings make Eq. (4.1) a commuting diagram, but not a commuting square in the sense of [10, 7], because in general $\jmath^L(B^L(O)) \cap \jmath^R(B^R(O)) \neq A(O)$.

The universal construction proceeds by the specification of the Q-system for $A(O) \subset C_{\mathrm{uni}}(O)$ as a braided product of the given Q-systems Q^L and Q^R. It is defined by $\Theta_{\mathrm{uni}} = \theta^L\theta^R$, and

$$W_{\mathrm{uni}} = w^L \times w^R \quad \text{and} \quad X_{\mathrm{uni}} = (1_{\theta^L} \times \varepsilon^-_{\theta^L,\theta^R} \times 1_{\theta^R}) \circ (x^L \times x^R). \tag{4.3}$$

Here, the requirement of left-locality determines the correct choice of the braiding $\varepsilon^-_{\rho,\sigma} = \varepsilon^*_{\sigma,\rho}$ in the conventions of [8], such that $\varepsilon^-_{\rho,\sigma} = 1$ whenever ρ is localized to the left of σ. We write $Q_{\mathrm{uni}} = Q^L \times^- Q^R$.

The commutativity of Q^L and Q^R implies [2, Prop. 4.19] that

$$C_{\mathrm{uni}}(O)' \cap C_{\mathrm{uni}}(O) = A(O)' \cap C_{\mathrm{uni}}(O).$$

This ensures that the central decomposition of $C_{\mathrm{uni}}(O)$ gives rise to irreducible boundary conditions, each of them arising in a representation with a unique vacuum vector.

Let $V_{\mathrm{uni}} \in C_{\mathrm{uni}}(O)$ be the canonical generator of the extension $A(O) \subset C_{\mathrm{uni}}(O)$, such that $(W_{\mathrm{uni}}, V_{\mathrm{uni}})$ is a solution to the conjugacy relations. The canonical generators of the intermediate embeddings of $B^L(O)$ and $B^R(O)$ are respectively

$$\jmath^L(v^L) = \iota_{\mathrm{uni}}(1_{\theta^L} \times w^{R*}) \cdot V_{\mathrm{uni}}, \quad \jmath^R(v^R) = \iota_{\mathrm{uni}}(w^{L*} \times 1_{\theta^R}) \cdot V_{\mathrm{uni}}. \tag{4.4}$$

We have in [2] characterized the minimal central projections of $C_{\mathrm{uni}}(O)$ as $E_a = \iota_{\mathrm{uni}}(q_a)V_{\mathrm{uni}}$, where $q_a \in \mathrm{Hom}(\Theta_{\mathrm{uni}}, \mathrm{id}_{C_{\mathrm{uni}}})$ satisfy $(q \times q) \circ X_{\mathrm{uni}} = q$ and $q^* = (q \times 1_{\Theta_{\mathrm{uni}}}) \circ X_{\mathrm{uni}}W_{\mathrm{uni}} = (1_{\Theta_{\mathrm{uni}}} \times q) \circ X_{\mathrm{uni}}W_{\mathrm{uni}}$. By Frobenius reciprocity, $q_a \in \mathrm{Hom}(\theta^L\theta^R, \mathrm{id})$ are in bijection with intertwiners

$$I_a = \varphi(q_a) := (1_{\theta^L} \times q_a) \circ (x^L w^L \times 1_{\theta^R}) \in \mathrm{Hom}(\theta^R, \theta^L),$$

and I_a are minimal projections of $[\mathrm{Hom}(\theta^R, \theta^L), *]$ equipped with the generalized $*$-product (cf. Sect. 4.4)

$$x^{L*} \circ (t_1 \times t_2) \circ x^R. \tag{4.5}$$

4.2 The hypergroup of boundary conditions

Let us first concentrate on the case $Q^L = Q^R$, i.e., the local extensions $A \subset B^L$ and $A \subset B^R$ are isomorphic. The boundary conditions under consideration are therefore boundary conditions between two isomorphic copies of a quantum field theory B. One may think of them as "discontinuities" of B, not affecting the subtheory A. In a Euclidean setting, one would think of a transition line between two different phases of continuum statistical system, the simplest nontrivial example being the ordered and the disordered phase of the critical Ising model [20, 2].

In this case, we shall suppress the superscripts L, R for the extensions $\iota : A \subset B$; but it is crucial to retain the superscripts for the intermediate embeddings $\jmath^L \neq \jmath^R$ of B into C. We thus have $\iota_{\mathrm{uni}} = \jmath^L \circ \iota = \jmath^R \circ \iota$.

Turning to the characterization of irreducible boundary conditions as above, we have to find the minimal projections $I_a \in [\mathrm{Hom}(\theta,\theta),*]$.

The following obvious conclusion was not explicitly mentioned in [3, 2]: The minimal projections $I_a \in \mathrm{Hom}(\theta,\theta)$ with respect to the $*$-product are mapped by the Fourier transform Eq. (2.6) to the minimal projections e_a of $\mathrm{Hom}(\gamma,\gamma)$ with respect to the ordinary $=$ concatenation product. The latter are the projections $e_a = s_a s_a^*$ as in Sect. 3 onto the irreducible subsectors $\gamma_a \prec \gamma$ that are all contained with multiplicity 1 by Prop. 2.1.

Lemma 4.1. *The minimal central projections of the universal construction are obtained by the chain of maps*

$$e_a \overset{\chi^{-1}}{\longmapsto} I_a \overset{\varphi^{-1}}{\longmapsto} q_a \mapsto E_a = \iota_{\mathrm{uni}}(q_a) V_{\mathrm{uni}}.$$

Equivalently, $\overline{\tau}_{\mathrm{uni}}(E_a) = \overline{\iota}(e_a)$ *as elements of* A.

Proof: We compute

$$\overline{\tau}_{\mathrm{uni}}(E_a) = \theta^2(q_a) X_{\mathrm{uni}} = \theta(q_a) x \theta(x) = x^* \theta(I_a)\theta(x) = \overline{\iota}(e_a).$$

The first equality follows from $\Theta_{\mathrm{uni}} = \theta^2$ and $\overline{\tau}_{\mathrm{uni}}(V_{\mathrm{uni}}) = X_{\mathrm{uni}}$. The second uses the definition Eq. (4.3) of X_{uni} and the commutativity of the Q-system (i.e., locality of the QFT B). The third uses $q_a = \varphi^{-1}(I_a)$ and the relations of the Q-system. The last equality uses $I_a = \chi^{-1}(e_a)$ and $x = \overline{\iota}(v)$. □

The following proposition relates the central projections E_a to the action of the hypergroup $K_{A\subset B}$ associated with the subfactor $A(O) \subset B(O)$ on the isometries $\psi_{n,i} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\iota, \iota\theta_n)$ as in Sect. 3.2.

Proposition 4.2. *The following equivalent expansions hold:*

$$\jmath^L(\psi_{n,j}^*)\jmath^R(\psi_{n,i}) = \sum\nolimits_a U_n(a)_{ji} \cdot E_a. \tag{4.6}$$

$$E_a = \sum\nolimits_{n,i} \frac{\dim_{\gamma_a} \dim_{\theta_n}}{(\dim_\iota)^2} \cdot \jmath^L \phi_a(\psi_{n,i}^*)\jmath^R(\psi_{n,i}). \tag{4.7}$$

Before we sketch the proof of these formulae, let us explain how they specify the irreducible boundary conditions selected by the central projections E_a: In the quantum field theory B, $\psi_{n,i}$ are "charged field operators" [2] that intertwine the vacuum representation of A with the DHR representations θ_n of A within the vacuum representation of B. They are embedded via Eq. (4.4) as $\jmath^L(\psi_{n,i})$ and $\jmath^R(\psi_{n,i})$ into the universal construction C_{uni}, and the operators $\jmath^L(\psi_{n,j}^*)\jmath^R(\psi_{n,i})$ span the center of C_{uni} [2]. Thus, they take numerical values in irreducible representations.

The irreducible boundary condition a is the representation of C_{uni} in which $\pi_a(E_b) = \delta_{ab} \cdot 1$. Thus one obtains the numerical values

Corollary 4.3.

$$\pi_a(\jmath^L(\psi_{n,j}))^* \cdot \pi_a(\jmath^R(\psi_{n,i})) = U_n(a)_{ji}. \tag{4.8}$$

In special cases, when this matrix of inner products happens to be unitary, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies linear relations between the embedded field operators $\pi_a(\jmath^L(\psi_{n,i}))$ and $\pi_a(\jmath^R(\psi_{n,i}))$. In particular, the trivial subsector $\gamma_0 = \mathrm{id}_B \Rightarrow \phi_0 = \mathrm{id}_B \Rightarrow \pi_a(\jmath^L(\psi_{n,j}))^* \cdot \pi_a(\jmath^R(\psi_{n,i})) = \delta_{ij}$ implies the trivial boundary condition $\jmath^L(\psi_{n,i}) = \jmath^R(\psi_{n,i})$. In the general case, a boundary condition is a sesquilinear relation, specifying "angles" between the two spaces of embedded charged field operators. In particular, a linear relation of the form "$\pi\jmath^R(\psi) = \pi\jmath^L(\phi(\psi))$" is in general not true, and in extreme cases, $\jmath^R(\psi)$ and $\jmath^L(\psi)$ are linearly independent in a given representation.

We indicate how the linearization works out in the case when A is a fixed-point subnet of B under some finite global gauge group G. In this case, the subsectors of γ are the gauge automorphisms γ_g of B, and $\phi_g = \gamma_g$ and the hypergroup is $K_{A\subset B} = G$. Therefore, $U_n(g)_{ji}$ are in fact the unitary matrix representations of G, and Lemma 3.6 becomes a familiar identity (Peter-Weyl). The scalar products

$$\pi_g\big(\jmath^L(\psi^*_{n,j})\jmath^R(\psi_{n,i})\big) = U_n(g)_{ji}$$

imply $X^*X = 0$ for $X = \pi_g\jmath^R(\psi_{n,i}) - \sum_j \pi_g\jmath^L(\psi_{n,j})U_n(g)_{ji}$. Hence

$$\pi_g\jmath^R(\psi_{n,i}) = \sum\nolimits_j \pi_g\jmath^L(\psi_{n,j})U_n(g)_{ji} = \pi_g\jmath^L(\gamma_g(\psi_{n,i})).$$

In other words: the boundary condition states that the left and right embeddings of B differ by the gauge transformation γ_g.

Proof of Prop. 4.2: Eq. (4.6) and Eq. (4.7) are clearly equivalent by Eq. (3.5) and Lemma 3.6. We shall prove Eq. (4.6).

It is convenient to prove the equality after application of $\overline{\iota}_{\mathrm{uni}}$. On the left-hand side, we use Eq. (4.4) to compute the embeddings of the left and right charged fields, as well as the definition of $X_{\mathrm{uni}} = \overline{\iota}_{\mathrm{uni}}(V_{\mathrm{uni}})$. We find

$$\overline{\iota}_{\mathrm{uni}}\big(\jmath^L(\psi^*_{n,j})\jmath^R(\psi_{n,i})\big) = x^*\theta(\varepsilon_{\theta,\theta}\theta(w_{n,j}w^*_{n,i})x).$$

By commutativity of the Q-system, this equals

$$\overline{\iota}_{\mathrm{uni}}\big(\jmath^L(\psi^*_{n,j})\jmath^R(\psi_{n,i})\big) = x^*\theta(w_{n,j}w^*_{n,i})\theta(x) = \overline{\iota}\big(\chi(w_{n,j}w^*_{n,i})\big).$$

On the right-hand side, we use Cor. 4.1 and Eq. (3.6), written as $s_a^* \circ \chi(w_{n,j}w^*_{n,i}) \circ s_a$. The sum over a can be trivially performed:

$$\sum\nolimits_a U_n(a)_{ji} \cdot \overline{\iota}_{\mathrm{uni}}(E_a) = \overline{\iota}\Big(\sum\nolimits_a s_a s_a^* \chi(w_{n,j}w^*_{n,i}) s_a s_a^*\Big) = \overline{\iota}\big(\chi(w_{n,j}w^*_{n,i})\big).$$

This concludes the proof. □

4.3 Composition of boundary conditions

In [18], one of us has defined a composition of boundary conditions which may be understood in physical terms as the boundary conditions between a QFT to the left of strip

$a < x < b$ and a QFT to the right of the strip that are, as sesquilinear relations or as angles between spaces of charged field operators, compatible with a pair of boundary conditions with a third QFT inside the strip ("juxtaposition of boundaries"). This composition is defined by the concatenation product of intertwiners $I_a \in \mathrm{Hom}(\theta, \theta)$ as in Cor. 4.1:

$$I_a I_b = \sum\nolimits_c C_{ab}^c \, I_c.$$

Under the Fourier transform Eq. (2.6) this amounts to the convolution product of the projections $e_a \in \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma, \gamma)$:

$$e_a * e_b = \sum\nolimits_c C_{ab}^c \, e_c,$$

and because the convolution product of two positive operators is positive, it is clear that C_{ab}^c are non-negative numbers.

Proposition 4.4. *Up to a trivial rescaling, this composition of boundary conditions is isomorphic to the hypergroup product of $K_{A\subset B}$.*

Proof: It is sufficient to go back to the proof of (ii) of Prop. 3.1. Let $s_{ab} \circ t_c = \alpha_{ab}^c \cdot s_c$. Then, by inserting the decomposition of unity $1_{\gamma_a\gamma_b} = \sum_i t_i t_i^*$ into $e_a * e_b$, one finds $e_a * e_b = \sum_c |\alpha_{ab}^c|^2 e_c$, i.e., $\dim_\iota \cdot e_a$ satisfy the same composition law Eq. (3.4) as ϕ_a. □

Examples: The GHJ subfactor (cf. Sect. 2) describes the E_6 conformal embedding $A(O) \subset B(O)$ of the chiral QFTs $SU(2)_{10} \subset SO(5)_1$ [19]. The nontrivial charged field operator ψ carries the DHR charge $s = 3$ of $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{10}$. The model admits one nontrivial boundary condition, for which the angle between $\jmath^L(\psi)$ and $\jmath^R(\psi)$ can be computed from the nontrivial one-dimensional representation of the hypergroup K_{GHJ}, $U(1) = -1/d_1 = \sqrt{3} - 2$.

The following examples have been worked out before we recognized that the common underlying structure is a hypergroup:

In [2], we presented the case of the two-dimensional relativistic Ising model as a prototype. Apart from the trivial boundary condition and the "fermionic" boundary condition that is a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ gauge transformation, there is a third "dual" boundary condition whose composition is a convex sum (mixture) of the trivial and fermionic ones. The dual boundary condition is the relativistic analogue of the phase boundary in which the ordered and the disordered phase of the critical Euclidean Ising model coexist along a line [20].

Czechowski [6] has computed the intertwiners I_a by diagonalizing the convolution product for Q-systems in several DHR categories that contain $\mathrm{Rep}(S_3)$, and has determined their composition.

For the canonical [15, 3] two-dimensional extension of the tensor product of left- and right-moving chiral QFTs $A \otimes A$ along a subcategory $\mathrm{Rep}(G) \subset \mathrm{DHR}(A)$, one finds $K_{A\otimes A\subset B} = \mathrm{Conj}(G)$ [18].

For the full center extensions $A \otimes A \subset B$ associated with a chiral Q-system q in $\mathrm{DHR}(A)$, where the chiral theory A has modular tensor category $\mathrm{DHR}(A)$, one finds that $K_{A\otimes A\subset B}$ is isomorphic to the hypergroup of the fusion category of q-q bimodules [3, 2]. This was first discovered, in a different setup, in [9].

4.4 The hypergroupoid of boundary conditions

The picture developped in the previous section naturally and with almost no effort generalizes to the case when the observables on both sides of the boundary are different extensions of $A(O)$. In this case, one arrives at a hypergroupoid whose objects X correspond to inequivalent extensions $A(O) \subset B^X(O)$, and whose arrows $k_a^{XY} \in \mathrm{Mor}(Y, X)$ satisfy the obvious generalization of Eq. (1.1). They are represented by completely positive maps $\phi_a^{XY} : B^Y(O) \to B^X(O)$.

For a boundary between QFTs B^L to the left and B^R to the right, we have $X = L$, $Y = R$. The Fourier transform Eq. (2.6) generalizes to a map $\chi : \mathrm{Hom}(\theta^R, \theta^L) \to \mathrm{Hom}(\iota^L\overline{\iota}^R, \iota^L\overline{\iota}^R)$. Correspondingly, the convolution product on $\mathrm{Hom}(\theta^R, \theta^L)$ is given as in Eq. (4.5).

The universal construction is given by the braided product of Q-systems, as in Sect. 4.1. Its minimal central projections E_a are obtained as in Cor. 4.1, with the obvious replacements $\gamma_a \prec \iota^L\overline{\iota}^R$, $e_a \in \mathrm{Hom}(\iota^L\overline{\iota}^R, \iota^L\overline{\iota}^R)$, $I_a \in \mathrm{Hom}(\theta^R, \theta^L)$, and $q_a \in \mathrm{Hom}(\theta^L\theta^R, \mathrm{id})$. Finally, Prop. 4.2 and Cor. 4.3 become

$$E_a = \sum\nolimits_{n,i} \frac{\dim_{\gamma_a} \dim_{\theta_n}}{\dim_{\iota^L} \dim_{\iota^R}} \cdot \jmath^L\phi_a(\psi_{n,i}^{L\,*})\jmath^R(\psi_{n,i}^R),$$

where n runs over all joint irreducible subsectors θ_n of θ^L and θ^R, and

$$\pi_a(\jmath^L(\psi_{n,j}^L))^* \cdot \pi_a(\jmath^R(\psi_{n,i}^R)) = U_n^{LR}(a)_{ji}$$

with

$$U_n^{LR}(a)_{ji} \cdot 1_{\gamma_a} = (v^{L*} \times s_a^*) \circ (1_{\iota^L} \times w_{n,j}^L w_{n,i}^{R\,*} \times 1_{\overline{\iota}^R}) \circ (s_a \times v^R).$$

Thus, the boundary conditions are sesquilinear relations between the charged field operators of B^L and B^R carrying common charges.

A A result on the quantization of dimensions

Let us return to the central decomposition of the braided product $Q \times^- Q$ of a commutative Q-system for $A \subset B$. It is defined by the minimal projections $E_a \in C'_{\mathrm{uni}} \cap C_{\mathrm{uni}}$ induced by the minimal projections $e_a \in \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma, \gamma)$ whose range is $\gamma_a \prec \gamma$, as in Sect. 4.2. The result is, for each a, an intermediate embedding

$$A \overset{\iota}{\hookrightarrow} B \overset{\jmath_a}{\hookrightarrow} C_a = E_a C_{\mathrm{uni}}$$

whose dual canonical endomorphism $\theta_a = \overline{\iota\jmath_a}\jmath_a\iota$ equals $\overline{\iota}\gamma_a\iota \prec \overline{\iota}\gamma\iota = \theta^2$. This equality does not imply that $\gamma_a = \overline{\jmath}_a\jmath_a$ (because ι is not surjective), but it implies $\dim_{\gamma_a} = \dim_{\overline{\jmath}_a\jmath_a} = (\dim_{\jmath_a})^2 = [C_a : B]$. Since the net of subfactors is entirely irrelevant in this argument, we have proven:

Proposition A.1. *If $N \subset M$ is an irreducible finite-index subfactor with a commutative Q-system, then the dimension $\dim(\gamma_a)$ of every irreducible sub-endomorphism γ_a of the canonical endomorphism $\gamma \in \mathrm{End}_0(M)$ equals the index of some subfactor.*

The statement in the conclusion is nontrivial, because in general, a dimension is a square root of an index, and the index is quantized below 4. The statement is trivially true for a fixed point subfactor $N = M^G$ under an outer action of a finite group, because all γ_a are automorphisms; it is also obvious for the canonical subfactor of a modular braided tensor category (also known as Longo-Rehren = Jones-Wassermann = two-interval = Cardy subfactor), because these subfactors are anti-self-dual, hence the sector decomposition of γ is isomorphic to that of $\theta \cong \bigoplus_\rho \rho \otimes \overline{\rho}$ with dimensions $\dim_{\rho\otimes\overline{\rho}} = (\dim_\rho)^2 = [N : \rho(N)]$. It can also be easily verified, e.g., for the GHJ subfactor (which is commutative because it describes the E_6 conformal embedding in conformal QFT) where the nontrivial subsector has $\dim(\gamma_a) = 2 + \sqrt{3} = (2\cos\frac{\pi}{12})^2$. To our knowledge, the statement of Prop. A.1 was not known to be a general fact.

Corollary A.2. *The index of an irreducible subfactor $N \subset M$ with commutative Q-system equals 1 plus a sum of indices $[L_a : M]$.*

This observation gives an obvious a priori quantization of the index below 5, with only one non-integer value below 4, namely $(2\cos(\frac{\pi}{10}))^2 = 1 + (2\cos(\frac{\pi}{5}))^2 = \frac{1}{2}(5+\sqrt{5}) \approx 3.618$, in accord with [5, Thm. 2.3].

References

[1] M. Bischoff: *Generalized orbifold construction for conformal nets*, arXiv:1608.00253.

[2] M. Bischoff, Y. Kawahigashi, R. Longo, K.-H. Rehren: *Phase boundaries in algebraic conformal QFT*, Commun. Math. Phys. **342** (2016) 1–45.

[3] M. Bischoff, Y. Kawahigashi, R. Longo, K.-H. Rehren: *Tensor categories of endomorphisms and inclusions of von Neumann algebras*, Springer Briefs in Math. Phys. **5** (2015) 1–104.

[4] M. Bischoff, K.-H. Rehren: work in progress.

[5] S. Carpi, Y. Kawahigashi, R. Longo: *On the Jones index values for conformal subnets*, Lett. Math. Phys. (2010) 99–108.

[6] R. Czechowski: *Classification of boundary conditions in models of conformal field theory*, Master thesis Göttingen 2015.

[7] D. Evans, Y. Kawahigashi: Quantum Symmetries on Operator Algebras, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Oxford Science Publications 1998.

[8] K. Fredenhagen, K.-H. Rehren, B. Schroer: *Superselection sectors with braid group statistics and exchange algebras I*, Commun. Math. Phys. **125** (1989) 201–226.

[9] J. Fröhlich, J. Fuchs, I. Runkel, C. Schweigert: *Correspondences of ribbon categories*, Ann. Math. **199** (2006) 192–329.

[10] F. Goodman, P. de la Harpe, V.F.R. Jones: Coxeter Graphs and Towers of Algebras, Mathematical Sciences Research Institute Publications **14**, Springer 1989.

[11] Y. Kawahigashi: *Classification of paragroup actions on subfactors*, Publ. RIMS **31** (1995) 481–517.

[12] Y. Kawahigashi, R. Longo, M. Müger: *Multi-interval subfactors and modularity of representations in conformal field theory*, Commun. Math. Phys. **219** (2001) 631–669.

[13] H. Kosaki, R. Longo: *A remark on the minimal index of subfactors*, J. Funct. Anal. **107** (1992) 458–470.

[14] R. Longo: *A duality for Hopf algebras and for subfactors*, Commun. Math. Phys. **159** (1994) 133–150.

[15] R. Longo, K.-H. Rehren: *Nets of subfactors*, Rev. Math. Phys. **7** (1995) 567–597.

[16] R. Longo, J.E. Roberts: *A theory of dimension*, K-Theory **11** (1997) 103–159.

[17] K.-H. Rehren: *Weak C* Hopf symmetry*, in: Quantum Groups Symposium at "Group21" (eds. H.-D. Doebner et al.), Goslar 1996 Proceedings, Heron Press, Sofia (1997), pp. 62–69 [arXiv:q-alg/9611007].

[18] K.-H. Rehren: *Boundaries in relativistic quantum field theory*, talk at the XVIII International Congress on Mathematical Physics 2015, to appear in the proceedings.

[19] K.-H. Rehren, Ya. Stanev, I.T. Todorov: *Characterizing invariants for local extensions of current algebras*, Commun. Math. Phys. **174** (1996) 605–633.

[20] B. Schroer, T.T. Truong: *The order/disorder quantum field operators associated with the two-dimensional Ising model in the continuum limit*, Nucl. Phys. **B 144** (1978) 80–122.

[21] V.S. Sunder: *II_1 factors, their bimodules and hypergroups*, Trans. AMS **330** (1992) 227–256.

[22] V.S. Sunder, N.J. Wildberger: *Actions of finite hypergroups*, J. Alg. Combin. **18** (2003) 135–151.